

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:	:	
	:	
	:	
W.R. GRACE & CO., et. al.,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-199 (Lead Case)
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-200
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-201
Debtors.	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-202
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-203
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-207
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-208
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 09-644
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 09-807
	:	
	:	<i>Procedurally Consolidated.</i>
	:	

Table of Contents

I.	Factual Background and Procedural History.....	3
A.	The Personal Injury Asbestos Litigation.....	3
B.	The State of Montana Duty to Warn Litigation.....	5
C.	BNSF Railway Company Litigation.....	7
D.	The Property Damage Litigation.....	7
E.	The Canadian Class Action Litigation.....	8
F.	Estate Asset and Fraudulent Conveyance Litigation with Grace Subsidiaries	9
G.	Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC Litigation.....	10
H.	Insurance Coverage Litigation.....	10
1.	The Grace–CNA Settlement Agreement.....	11
2.	AXA Belgium, GEICO, and Republic Excess General Liability Insurance Policies with Grace.....	13
I.	Bank Lender Pre-Petition Litigation.....	14
J.	Grace’s Bankruptcy Petition and The Joint Plan of Reorganization.....	14
K.	Bank Lender Post-Petition Litigation.....	16
L.	The Bankruptcy Court Proceedings.....	20

II.	Standard of Review.....	21
A.	Standard of Review Regarding Approval of the Settlement Agreement.....	21
B.	Standard of Review Regarding Confirmation of the Joint Plan.....	22
III.	The Grace and CNA Companies’ Settlement Agreement.....	24
A.	Application of the <u>Martin</u> Factors.....	26
B.	Fairness of the Settlement Agreement Related to Appellants’ Purported Rights to the Disputed Insurance Policies.....	30
1.	BNSF’s Objections.....	30
2.	The Libby Claimants’ Objections.....	33
IV.	Confirmation of the Joint Plan.....	43
A.	The Good Faith Requirement.....	43
B.	Asbestos Liability Trusts Under Section 524(g).....	49
1.	The Two Trust Structure of the Joint Plan.....	49
2.	Requirements of a Proper Trust Under Section 524(g).....	52
C.	The Section 524(g) Channeling Injunction.....	54
1.	The Scope of the Channeling Injunction.....	55
a.	Extension of the Channeling Injunction to Independent Insurer Wrongdoing Claims.....	55
b.	Extension of the Channeling Injunction to BNSF.....	61
c.	AMH’s Objections to the Scope of the Channeling Injunction.....	64
2.	The Fairness and Equality of the Channeling Injunction.....	65
a.	Application of the Channeling Injunction to MCC.....	65
b.	Application of the Channeling Injunction to CNA.....	68
i.	BNSF’s Objections.....	68
ii.	The Libby Claimants’ Objections.....	71
3.	The Effect of the Channeling Injunction on Releases from Liability Under the Joint Plan.....	74
D.	Classification of Creditor Claims.....	76
1.	The Section 1122(a) Classification Requirement.....	76
2.	Circumvention of the Section 524(g) Injunction.....	79

3.	Definitional Requirements of “Claims” and “Demands” Under the Bankruptcy Code.....	81
a.	Claims Under the Bankruptcy Code.....	81
b.	Demands Under the Bankruptcy Code.....	84
E.	Feasibility of the Joint Plan.....	85
1.	AMH’s Feasibility Claims.....	88
2.	Montana’s Feasibility Claims.....	94
F.	Equality of Treatment Among Creditors.....	96
1.	The Libby Claimants’ Discrimination Claims.....	97
a.	The TDP Criteria for Category IV-B.....	98
b.	Pre-Bankruptcy Settlements.....	102
c.	Grace’s Non-Products Insurance Coverage.....	104
2.	BNSF’s Discrimination Claims.....	107
a.	Equal Treatment Under Section 1123(a)(4).....	107
b.	Administrative Costs.....	116
3.	Montana and the Crown’s Discrimination Claims.....	118
a.	Failure to Warn Liability.....	118
b.	The Effect of Timing on Treatment of Creditor Claims.....	120
c.	Equality of Payment and Treatment of Claims in Different Classes Under the Joint Plan.....	122
4.	AMH’s Discrimination Claims.....	124
G.	The Best Interest of the Creditors Test.....	127
1.	The Level of Specificity Required.....	128
2.	The Consideration of Evidence Concerning Tort System Values.....	131
3.	Recovery from Grace’s Insurers in a Hypothetical Chapter 7 Case.....	134
H.	Impairment of Claims in Chapter 11 Reorganization Plans.....	142
1.	The Bank Lenders’ Claims.....	143
a.	Entitlement to the Post-Petition Default Interest Rate.....	144
b.	Section 1124(1) and Alleged Impairment Under the Joint Plan.....	159
c.	Solvency and Impairment.....	160

2.	AMH's Claims.....	165
a.	Entitlement to Post-Petition Interest.....	165
b.	The Effect of Impairment on Voting Rights.....	167
I.	The Libby Claimants Right to Trial by Jury Claims.....	168
1.	Rights Under the Seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution.....	169
2.	Statutory Rights Pursuant to Section 1411(a).....	175
J.	The Fair and Equitable Test and The Absolute Priority Rule.....	178
K.	Garlock's Objections to the Joint Plan.....	182
1.	Garlock's Standing.....	182
a.	Injury in Fact.....	184
b.	Causation and Redressability.....	194
c.	Statutory Standing.....	195
2.	Garlock's Arguments On the Merits.....	196
a.	"Fair and Equitable" Under the Bankruptcy Code.....	197
b.	The Effect of the Joint Plan and TDP on Garlock's Alleged Pre- Petition Rights to Contribution and Set-off.....	203
c.	Appointment of an Independent Representative for Garlock's Alleged Future Demands.....	209
L.	The Anti-Assignment Provisions in Insurance Policies.....	214
M.	Residual Bank Lenders Issues.....	219
1.	The Best Interests of the Creditors Test and Legal Rate of Interest Objections.....	220
2.	The Absolute Priority Rule Objections.....	221
3.	The Fair and Equitable Test and the Authority of the Unsecured Creditors Committee to Bind the Bank Lenders.....	223
4.	Dissolution of the Unsecured Creditors Committee.....	226
V.	Conclusion	228